

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application, and the consideration given the previous arguments. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 10 and added Claims 23-25. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-25 remain pending in this application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed June 13, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 18 stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0261965 ("Eisen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,419 ("Legh-Smith"). Claims 2, 11, and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisen in view of Legh-Smith as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0108121 ("Alao"). Claims 4-8 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisen, Legh-Smith as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,740 ("Parekh").

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show: that the prior art references teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; that there is some suggestion or motivation in the references (or within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art) to modify or combine the references; and that there is a reasonable expectation of success. M.P.E.P. 2142, 2143; In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Applicant respectfully points out that a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be made as each of the claim limitations is not present in the cited references. Consequently, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites a method of profiling a user comprising: accessing first data including a first identifier associated with the user, network addresses accessed by the user, and temporal information related to the user identifier and the network addresses, wherein

the first data is determined at a first location remote from the user; accessing second data at a second location remote from the user and the network addresses, wherein accessing the second data further comprises sending at least some of the network addresses to the second location and receiving corresponding category information for each of the at least some network addresses, the corresponding category information including at least one meta tag; and generating a user profile based at least in part on the first identifier, corresponding category information, and at least some of the temporal information, wherein category information can be sorted in chronological order. Claim 10 recites similar limitations.

Thus, embodiments of the present invention may generate a user profile based on the user's interests by allowing a user to "surf" a network on a client computer while a remote location, such as a server computer responsible for routing user requests, determines information ("first data") relating to the surfing user, such as a user identifier, temporal information related to the user identifier, network addresses accessed and timestamps. This remote location may then store this information in a table to which it has access. The user may then be routed to any of the intended network destinations or addresses. Using this first data, specifically network addresses associated with the first data, category information corresponding to these network addresses can be accessed using second data which includes network addresses and corresponding category information. Based on the first user identifier, the category information obtained via accessing the second data, and at least some of the temporal information, a user profile can be generated. This user profile can be sorted to provide the category information in chronological order. In other words, the order in which a user accessed certain categories may be determined from the user profile.

After reviewing the portions of the references cited by the Examiner, including the Eisen, Legh-Smith, Alao or Parekh references, Applicant cannot find where any of these references discloses a user profile comprising category information and at least some temporal information where the category information can be sorted by chronological order. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of independent Claims 1 and 10 and their respective dependent Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11 and 13-22.



Newly Added Claims 23-25

Claims 23-25 have been added to more distinctly point out and claim embodiments of the present invention, support for which can be found in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the full allowance of Claims 23-25.


CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-25. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant


Ari G. Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

Date: September 13, 2006

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9226
Fax. (512) 371-9088